

1 ROB BONTA, State Bar No. 202668
2 Attorney General of California
3 JON S. ALLIN, State Bar No. 155069
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
4 JEREMY DUGGAN, State Bar No. 229854
Deputy Attorney General
1300 I Street, Suite 125
P.O. Box 944255
5 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
Telephone: (916) 210-6008
6 Fax: (916) 324-5205
E-mail: Jeremy.Duggan@doj.ca.gov
7 *Attorneys for Defendants*
8 *Burnes, Pena, Garcia, Gallemore, Maytubby, and*
Munoz

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
FRESNO DIVISION

DORA SOLARES,
v.
RALPH DIAZ, et al.,

Plaintiff.

1:20-CV-00323-LHR

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO OSUNA'S EMERGENCY MOTION

Judge: The Honorable Lee H.
Rosenthal
Action Filed: March 2, 2020

1 Non-party Osuna seeks seventeen separate types of relief in a wide-ranging motion filed
2 June 30, 2025. (Osuna’s Emergency Motion at 18-20, ECF No. 183.) Defendants Burnes, Pena,
3 Garcia, Gallemore, Maytubby, and Munoz oppose the relief sought in items 13 and 14, which
4 assert that Defendants’ counsel has a unwaivable conflict in representing Defendants. (*Id.* at 19.)
5 The same Defendants further propose that in place of the relief sought by Osuna, the Court should
6 consider a stay of this litigation, because Osuna’s Fifth Amendment rights are implicated.

7 **I. DEFENDANTS’ COUNSEL IS NOT CONFLICTED.**

8 In item 13, Osuna asserts that “The Attorney General’s continued participation in both
9 matters constitutes an unwaivable conflict of interest.” (*Id.*) There is no conflict of interest. A
10 conflict of interest arises where representation of one client is adverse to, or materially limits,
11 representation of another client. (Cal. Rule of Professional Conduct 1.7.) In this matter, the
12 Attorney General’s office represents Defendants Burnes, Pena, Garcia, Gallemore, Maytubby,
13 and Munoz. Osuna asserts that the Attorney General is also representing the State of California in
14 Osuna’s criminal prosecution. (Osuna’s Mot. at 19.) The Defendants represented by the
15 Attorney General (state employees and former state employees) on the one hand, and the State of
16 California on the other, are not adverse to one another, and representation of one does not limit
17 the Attorney General’s representation of the other. Accordingly, there is no conflict.

18 In item 14, Osuna asserts that “sanctions or disqualification of conflicted counsel may be
19 appropriate.” (*Id.*) As shown above, there is no conflict. Accordingly, neither sanctions nor
20 disqualification is appropriate. Osuna’s motion should be denied as to items 13 and 14.

21 **II. THE COURT SHOULD CONSIDER A STAY.**

22 While much of the relief sought by Osuna is not warranted, he raises a valid concern about
23 the potential for compromise of the criminal prosecution should this civil matter go forward to
24 further discovery. (Osuna’s Mot. at 3 (asserting potential compromise to Osuna’s due process
25 and Fifth Amendment rights).) This Court should consider a stay of this civil matter in favor of
26 allowing that criminal matter to proceed unfettered. *See e.g., Keating v. Office of Thrift*
27 *Supervision*, 45 F.3d 322, 324 (9th Cir. 1995) (Decision whether to stay civil proceeding in the
28 face of a parallel criminal proceeding should be made “in light of the particular circumstances and

1 competing interests involved in the case.”) When considering whether to stay civil litigation in
2 favor of a parallel criminal proceeding, the main factor to consider is whether the criminal
3 defendant’s Fifth Amendment rights are implicated. *Id.* (identifying factors. Here, Osuna asserts
4 that his Fifth Amendment rights would be compromised by further discovery in this matter.
5 (Osuna’s Mot. at 2-3.) If Osuna’s Fifth Amendment rights would be compromised, the Court
6 should stay this civil proceeding while the criminal proceeding remains pending.

7 Dated: July 8, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

8 ROB BONTA
9 Attorney General of California
10 JON S. ALLIN
11 Supervising Deputy Attorney General

12 */s/ Jeremy Duggan*

13 JEREMY DUGGAN
14 Deputy Attorney General
15 *Attorneys for Defendants*
16 *Burnes, Pena, Garcia, Gallemore, Maytubby,*
17 *and Munoz*

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
SA2019101902
39145215.docx

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Case Name: **Dora Solares v. Ralph Diaz, et al.** No. **1:20-CV-00323-LHR**

I hereby certify that on July 8, 2025, I electronically filed the following documents with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system:

➤ DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO OSUNA'S EMERGENCY MOTION

Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the CM/ECF system.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on July 8, 2025, at Sacramento, California.

K. Vitalie

Declarant for eFiling

/s/ *K. Vitalie*

Signature

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service with postage thereon fully prepaid that same day in the ordinary course of business.

I further certify that some of the participants in the case are not registered CM/ECF users. On July 8, 2025, the foregoing document(s) have been mailed in the Office of the Attorney General's internal mail system, by First-Class Mail, postage prepaid, or have dispatched it to a third party commercial carrier for delivery within three (3) calendar days to the following non-CM/ECF participants:

Jamie Osuna, BD-0868
California State Prison, Corcoran (3476)
P.O. BOX 3476
CORCORAN, CA 93212-3476

In Pro Per

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on July 8, 2025, at Sacramento, California.

I. Martinez

Declarant for Service by U.S. Mail

/s/ *I. Martinez*

Signature